| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/645,425 | DECKERS ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Rip A. Lee | 1713 | |

**All Participants:**

(1) *Rip A. Lee*.

(2) *Anna Lisa Gallo*.

**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

**Date of Interview:** *August 11, 2005*

**Time:** _____

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:
*Sassmannshausen et al. (J. Orgnomet. Chem., 1999)*

Claims discussed:
*1 and 2*

Prior art documents discussed:
*Sassmannshausen et al. (J. Orgnomet. Chem., 1999)*

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants' claim 2 recites reaction conditions which appear to be essential for selective trimerization. Polymerization reactions described in Sassmannshusen et al. are carried out at 0.1 MPa (1 bar); the reference does not teach or fairly suggest use of pressures of 0.2 to 14 MPa (2-140 bar), as recited in claim 2. Therefore, in order to advance prosecution, the examiner suggests incorporation of the subject matter of claim 2 into claim 1 to render the parent claim allowable. Without citing reaction conditions, claim 1 would be anticipated, or alternatively, be obvious over Sassmannshausen et al. because any adventitious amount of trimer made during polymerization would meet the subject matter of claim 1 (as currently written). In this case, Applicants would have the opportunity to provide experimental results to establish any unobviousness differences between the claimed subject matter and that of the prior art (i.e., duplicate the experiments of the reference iin order to show that trimer products are not formed).